JFK assassination records appeals Harold Weisberg 8/16/79
Informants disclosed
Inconsistent withholdings
Inadequate searches - N.O. and FBIHQ

Attached 62-109060-4885 relates to Prentiss Davis and Dean Adams Andrews. The covering NO airtel for the LHM discloses, after initial suggestion of withholding by the analyst, of filing in N.O. as 137-2409, whereas the sources is obliterated in the text. The obliteration does not appear to be of Mr. Davis' name.

Normally the filed offices have records of information not included in LHM's intended for distribution. I recall no such information in N.O. records provided.

The LHM has an illegible notation on the right side, where duplicate filings are customarily indicated. I believe this indicates another FBIHQ filing, not provided.

This Davis appears to have been a criminal informant of the N.O. field office. The LHM states that he knows Andrews, who is a lawyer Oswald consulted in New Orleans and is the one who brought attention to the name of Clay Bertrand, which figured in the Warren and Garrison investigations and the Clay Shaw prosecution.

A Davis of similar but apparently not identical name appears in Warren Commission records as Andrews' investigator. However, consultation with the New Orleans phone book for the period of the record discloses that there is no listing identical with the name in the Commission records but after the name of Prentiss Davis, of the same address in the LHM, appears an accurate description of the one who was the Andrews investigator, Sgt. This tends to suggest rather strongly that the FBI's informant was also Andrews' investigator.

While ordinarily this might appear to have no special significance several factors are significant. One is that if Andrews' investigator was an FBI symbolled informant this fact was not disclosed to the Commission. Another is that the records provided to the Commission by the FBI have the intent of making it appear that Davis undermined Andrews' credibility, which the FBI also undertook to do in other ways then and since. Still another is that the New Orleans records provided do not include all Davis informa-

tion, as of the time of the Commission and Garrison periods.

These and other factors add significance to the special use the FBI made of the information it attributed to the Andrews investigator, making it appear to the Commission that when Andrews was under normal sedation at a hospital he was under extraordinary sedation and did not know what he was talking about in stating that he was asked by Clay Bertrand to represent Oswald and that Oswald had never sought legal assistance from Andrews. In fact the FBI had confirmation from another lawyer and I have interviewed him and Andrews on this.

Moreover, there are solid indentifications of the existence of a Clay Bertrand or of one using that name in records I have, not used by the Commission, but I have no records of the FBI's efforts to follow that up or of its drawing together at any one point or in any one report all references to a Clay Bertrand. Given the significance of these facts and of the fact that the FBI did have reports that Clay Shaw was Clay Bertrand and that the descriptions of their sexual preferences, homosexuality, are the same, and what from personal knowledge I know to be the case, that Andrews' law specialties included handling the cases of homosexuals, I believe this can be a significant matter and that it justifies a much more diligent search than the records provided reflect.

In a separate appeal I am providing you with further information bearing on this and Shaw and on improper withholding of what was also disclosed. The nature of the entirely unjustifiable withholdings in those records, which I will explain, tends to add importance to this appeal and to the purposes of some FBI withholdings that are entirely outside any exemption of the Act.

Harold Weisberg